

the language from the bill has been taken...it's...it's, for the most part, modeled on the North Dakota law, with a couple of exceptions that I went through the other day, I guess yesterday. For example, the definition of abortion was taken from the Pennsylvania case, which certainly has been upheld, also is the same language from the North Dakota case or North Dakota law. The...some of the language on the...the...some of the others have been taken from the Pennsylvania law, the Mississippi law. And the reason, as I mention, we've done this is that those are tried and true, the court has upheld. The Supreme Court, of course, has decided the Planned Parenthood v. Casey case in Pennsylvania, which upheld their law. We know what is acceptable in that law because it's been considered. The Mississippi law has been considered at both the trial and appellate levels, and the Supreme Court refused to hear the case any further. The North Dakota case has been upheld by the North Dakota Federal District Court. Oral arguments are scheduled in...April 14th in front of the Eighth Circuit Court of Appeals. The reason we model on North Dakota is because that's Eighth Circuit, which is the circuit that we're in; then other language taken from cases or statutes that we know the United States Supreme Court has upheld. With that, when the amendments are...that gives you some background for the reasoning on the amendments. As far as policy discussions, as we get into this, I'd be happy to continue to discuss those policy statements. With that, I would urge that the amendment to the amendment be adopted to the committee amendments.

SPEAKER BAACK: Thank you, Senator Lindsay. Discussion?
Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker and members of the Legislature, yesterday there was considerable discussion on the floor about the compromises, as they were called, which had been reached on this bill. The compromises, as they're called, may have changed some wording, added certain words, may have deleted other words, I'm not certain. But as far as the onerous impact of the bill, nothing was changed whatsoever. This is the kind of compromise which always occurs, as Senator Lindsay well knows, when an osprey is negotiating with a fish in shallow water. The osprey winds up with a meal, and the fish winds up with a warm home, inside the stomach of the osprey. If LB 110 were to be changed by amendment 1309, so that AM1309 would be the bill, I don't see how anybody who participated in the negotiations that resulted in the so-called compromises could support it. What is being